DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 152 SP 005 553

AUTHOR Brottman, Marvin A.
TITLE Innovations in Teacher Education?
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Innovation; *Educational Needs; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teachers Colleges

ABSTRACT

Program descriptions from 44 training institutions were examined regarding the process they employed in teacher education. Eight questions designed to identify various aspects of the process were applied to the written descriptions. The responses illustrate that: 1) program experiences are developed primarily by examination of the teaching task and other training programs; 2) expectations are conveyed to students through course offerings and through written and informal statements of goals; 3) student information consists primarily of academic ability represented by grades and faculty rating; 4) there is little indication of how student information is used; 5) student evaluation is mainly by observation of outside personnel, grades, and some self-evaluation; 6) criterion measures of effectiveness are the achievement of specific program goals and reports on teacher performance; 7) most programs have limited flexibility; and 8) preservice and in-service programs are usually seen as separate entities, and contacts between teachers are mostly informal and do not affect the nature of the basic program. The author concludes that programs now appear to meet only the needs of teachers to survive in the classroom. For teachers to be innovative and meet the needs of their students, they must participate in programs that are innovative and that meet their needs. (MBM)

ED 061152

N-NPO
SP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Innovations in Teacher Education?

Marvin A. Brottman

Governors State University
Park Forest South, Illinois 60466

SP005553

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association,
Chicago, Illinois, April 3 - 7, 1972.

Innovations in Teacher Education?

In the present period of social and educational ferment, it is time to question the changes that are taking place in the field of teacher preparation. To what extent are institutions of higher education establishing programs that are responsive to present as well as future needs of the common school and the individual child? Are they relating requirements and expectations of schools and universities to the needs of the prospective teacher? An examination of the content, process, and structure of teacher education programs considered to be in the vanguard of change may provide clues to the areas requiring concentrated study and modification.

Any consideration of teacher education requires identification of the expectations of the training institution, the needs of the prospective teacher in the training program, and how the experiences provided affect the perceptions and behavior of prospective teachers and program personnel. These elements together comprise a social system of teacher education as a psychosocial model.[1, 2] In the present studies questions derived from this model were applied to a sample of existing programs in order to provide a systematic examination of their major components and to point up areas that seem to require attention while modifications and innovations are being proclaimed.

The analysis will extend over a sample of programs of the more than 1200 institutions in the United States preparing teachers for elementary and secondary schools. It will (1) ask specific questions of the programs regarding the process of program development; (2) compare the process implied by description to the process rated by program directors; (3) compare the content of these programs to the content of other programs; and (4) relate the content of these programs to descriptions of process.

Teacher Program Survey

Because of the large number of institutions engaged in the preparation of teachers, it became necessary to select a sample of institutions for inclusion in the analysis. Of the more than 1200 institutions preparing teachers, 840 institutions are members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Each year since 1965, the AACTE has encouraged institutions to share their ideas in education by sponsoring "The Distinguished Achievement Award for Excellence in Teacher Education."

In 1969, 95 institutions entered program descriptions in the competition. It was thought that this group of institutions would constitute a sample of some of the most innovative programs for teacher preparation in the country.[3]

Accordingly, letters were sent to the executive officer of each of the 95 institutions asking for descriptive information of their most innovative program in teacher preparation. Replies were received from 80 institutions; 60 sent information, but only 44 sent information with detail sufficient to provide answers to the questions asked of the programs. These 44 institutions constitute the sample for analysis; the remaining 51 are considered non-respondents for purposes of this analysis.

Eight questions were derived from the psycho-social model and applied to program process and content.

The critical nature of program experiences in affecting the behavior of prospective teachers is apparent in that the training experiences provide the basis upon which students will interpret subsequent experiences from both inside and outside of the program. Because of the importance of these experiences, it is necessary to question the basis for, and the process of, their initiation, development, and evaluation.

At a general level, the question asked was (1) What are the bases for the development of program experiences? Answers to this question indicate if institutional expectations and individual needs are considered in the development of experiences. This question was supported by the more specific querie, (2) How does your program convey its expectations to the students over the total time of the program? The answers to this question allow an understanding of the part played by past program experiences (and other institutional procedures) in enabling students to understand what the institution expects of them.

Individual needs constitutes the second dimension of the model and should provide the second major basis of program experiences. To determine the extent to which needs are perceived and utilized, two more questions were asked of programs. (3) What kinds of information is obtained about student ability, attitudes, and values before and during their participation in the program? (4) How is information of student ability, attitudes, and values utilized in program development? The answers to these questions would provide criteria for the evaluation of the relevance of program experiences to the needs of the prospective teacher.

Every teacher preparation program evaluates the performance of its prospective teachers. Within the model, evaluation of student performance must consider program experiences in relation to institutional expectations and individual needs. To gather information in this area, programs were asked, (5) How is the performance of prospective teachers evaluated? Their answers would suggest the appropriateness of the criteria used in evaluation as compared to those criteria used in the development of the program experiences.

Total program effectiveness is sometimes associated with the competence of participating individuals. The model implies that program evaluation

should be related to program expectations. Whether or not they may be determined by asking (6) What are the criterion measures of program effectiveness?

The model identifies teacher education as a process in which a prospective teacher assumes several different but closely related identities as he moves sequentially through the roles of student, pre-service teacher, beginning teacher, and experienced teacher. Each role is assumed as the individual is able to incorporate the expectations for the roles within his existing personality structure. Because of the uniqueness of every individual, the timing or sequencing of program experiences should be flexible and permit individualized programming within the limits of program resources. How much flexibility is allowed may be determined from answers to question (7) To what extent does the time spent in training and the experiences provided reflect the changing role of prospective teachers over the time of the total program?

A related question is based on the assumption that teacher education is a continuous process in that a teacher does not stop acquiring teaching skills after certification as a teacher. If teacher education is continuous, are there provisions for relationships between experiences for traditionally separate pre-service and inservice teachers? Answers to the eighth question would provide such information. (8) What relationship is there in the program between pre-service and in-service education?

The eight questions described above together with alternative answers taken from program descriptions provided by the 44 sample programs will be considered in the next section.

Questions and Answers

The application of the first question to program descriptions yielded several alternative answers.

1. What are the bases of the development of program experiences?

	Number of Programs
a. Job Analysis of teaching	30
b. Evaluation of ongoing programs	21
c. Response to certification and accreditation agencies	7
d. No clear indication	7

Most programs continue to look to the schools and educational practices as the sources of their program experiences. Where social needs are identified, they are expressed in terms of the needs to which schools respond, not as a response from teacher education. Support for a selection of experiences is derived by observing practices in other institutions. If prestige schools are using micro-teaching and video-taped performance, then it must be a worth-while experience.

Those schools whose programs responded to certification and accreditation agencies placed the most emphasis on their program meeting certain standards. All programs indicated the importance of certification in planning the total curriculum.

The seven programs listed as having no clear indication of the bases of their program experiences could be categorized as using tradition as a basis.

The importance of the responses to the first questions should also include omissions. No program indicated social needs or the personal needs of prospective teachers as a consideration in program development. It appears that responding to school needs is a part of the philosophy which guides the program. Prospective teachers are selected who fit the total program structure rather than providing for modifying the structure to fit the students. This interpretation is supported by answers to the second question.

2. How does the program convey its expectations to students over the entire time of the program?

a.	Course content	44
b.	Specific goals of the program	31
c.	Advisor assigned to each student	18
d.	Specific criteria for admission	8
e.	Requires specific level of achievement	6
f.	No clear indication	6

The specification of total program experiences in general conveys what the program expects of its participants. This is also generally true when a program identifies its objectives in terms of teacher competence. How content relates to goals is not always clear. Clarification of this relationship is often accomplished by having an advisor interpret to the student how his experiences will better enable him to reach the program's goals. In those instances, student goals are assumed to be similar or at least parallel to those of the institution.

Although all programs had general criteria for admission to teacher training and had general requirements of achievement for remaining in the program, few programs had specific criteria for either. The selection of students for admission by use of general criteria limits the likelihood of admitting students whose expectations of program opportunities will match institutional expectations. The absence of clear levels of achievement suggests a lack of clarity of expectations.

The institutions which were ambigious about procedures for conveying expectations relied almost exclusively on course content as their vehicle. The third question asked:

3. What kinds of information is obtained about student ability, attitudes, and values before and during their participation in the program?

a.	Academic ability represented by grade-point average and completion of specified courses.	44
b.	Ratings of student performance by supervisors and cooperating teachers.	30
c.	Use of standardized tests such as the National Teacher Examination, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, or the Graduate Record Examination.	5
d.	No clear indication	11

All colleges utilized academic achievement and most used ratings by non-academic personnel in determining general student competence. The use of techniques to obtain specific information about attitudes and values was extremely limited in the programs surveyed. Where their use was reported, it was usually part of a project, research, or evaluation.

Perhaps the most significant finding is that there were 11 programs in which no clear indication was given of the kinds of information obtained. It may be that for these programs, the traditional formal achievement of grades and ratings by field personnel is sufficient. How all this information about students is incorporated into the program is the subject of question four.

4. How is information of student ability, attitudes, and values utilized in program development?

a.	It is used in modifying the content and/or sequence of specific courses.	11
b.	It is used in modifying the conception of the entire program.	1
c.	No clear indication	33

This question is really asking what is done with the information collected about students. The responses provided give only a partial answer. It appears that although most programs collect information about their students, the information is used to modify the program in some way by one-third of the sample. There may be,of course, informal ways of utilizing these data, but there was no indication of this in the descriptions provided.

The fifth question was addressed to the evaluation of prospective teachers.

5. How is the performance of prospective teachers evaluated?

a. Descriptive observations by others outside of the program.	35
b. Grades in formal courses and field experiences	29
c. Self-evaluation by students using personal and given criteria.	16
d. Pool of formal and informal data of academic and teaching performance.	11
e. No clear indication	5

In most programs, descriptive observations by personnel outside the program were those of supervisors, cooperating teachers, and faculty advisors. In those cases where self-evaluation did take place, the responses were given to a self-report instrument. The small number in the "data pool" may have resulted from vagaries of specification of evaluation procedures or content. Overall, it appears that evaluation of performance based on the expectations of the institution takes precedence over other criteria.

Program effectiveness is a question related to student performances.

6. What are the criterion measures of program effectiveness?

a.	Achievement of specified program goals.	26
b.	Reports from school personnel of teacher competence (informal).	23
c.	Certification acquired at conclusion of program.	7
d.	Students enter and remain in the profession after completion of program.	7
e.	No clear indication.	9

A majority of programs specified their goals in their descriptions in addition to indications of the relationship of the goals to the needs of education. The implication is that achievement of program goals by students would reflect program effectiveness.

The reports from school personnel (Item b) were perceived both during the program as well as afterward and involved a consideration of how well new teachers performed their duties in comparison to some normative measure. Included in this criterion were reports from recent graduates of how well the program prepared them for teaching.

Most programs indicated specifically that their graduates would be certified to teach. Seven institutions pointedly observed that only those students who successfully completed the program would be certified to teach. Success in the program was equated with suitability to teach.

Seven programs indicated an interest in their students who enter and remain in the teaching profession. There were clear indications that this information was important in determining program effectiveness.

7. To what extent does the time spent in training and the experiences provided reflect the changing role of prospective teachers over time?

a.	Courses and other experiences are specified.	29
b.	Courses and other experiences are flexible.	14
c.	Sequence of experiences specified.	28
d.	Sequence of experiences flexible.	14
e.	Time spent in program specified.	38
f.	Time spent in program flexible.	4
g.	Individualized program available.	5
h.	No clear indication.	1

This was probably the most difficult question of all to answer. Programs were unclear in their descriptions of the flexibility available to prospective teachers at different points in their program. The inequality of sums in each category is an indication of the lack of comparable information for all programs.

A majority of programs spelled out their requirements for completion of the professional sequence and the place of each experience in the total program. In the later instance, each course was to be taken in a particular year and each course had certain prerequisites. Where courses and sequences were flexible, alternative procedures were usually specified.

Most programs clearly specified their length; only four allowed prospective teachers the opportunity to demonstrate their competence within a flexible time schedule. In one program, the description was so vague that it provided no clear indication of provisions for changes in teacher role.

Overall, the sample programs did not reflect the changing role of the prospective teacher in their experiences, sequence, and time.

The last question posed was:

8. What relationship is there in the program between pre-service and in-service education?

   a. Pre-service and in-service teachers share same experiences. 10

   b. Pre-service and in-service teachers actively cooperate in program activities. 9

   c. Graduates of the program provide information for program evaluation. 6

   d. No clear indication. 25

Most programs had no provisions for a formal relationship between pre-service and in-service teachers. Those programs that had such provisions had either an informal relationship such as both groups of teachers participating in an orientation meeting, or feedback from recent graduates. Only nine programs had provisions for the sharing of courses and active involvement which could affect future program development. Clearly, there was little relationship between these two roles in most programs.

To summarize, program descriptions of 44 training institutions were examined with respect to the process they employed in the preparation of prospective teachers. Eight questions, designed to identify various aspects of the process, were derived from the model and applied to the written descriptions. The answers were then categorized according to their frequency.

The responses illustrate that:

1. Program experiences are developed primarily by examination of the teaching task and of other training programs.
2. Program expectations are conveyed to students through course offerings and written and informal statements of program goals.

3. The information obtained about students consists primarily of their academic ability represented by grades and ratings by program personnel.
4. There is little indication how information about students is utilized in program development and evaluation.
5. Evaluation of student performance is mainly by observations of personnel outside of the program, by grades in courses, and by some self-evaluation. Data pools were established by some institutions.
6. Criterion measures of program effectiveness are the achievement of specific program goals and reports from school personnel of teacher performance in the field.
7. Most programs have a clearly specified number, type, and sequence of program experiences. Where flexibility is available, it is within specified options.
8. Pre-service and in-service programs are seen as separate entities by most institutions. Contacts between teachers are mostly informal and do not affect the nature of the basic program.

Directors, Readers and Process

Any determination of the presence (or absence) of process by examination of written descriptions is subject to error in reading even detailed program descriptions. Another reader examined the descriptions of the sample programs and agreed substantially with the presence of the particular program components previously reported.

To compare the process as written with the process as perceived, the Director of every program was asked to indicate the presence of each category and to rank each in the order of the importance he attached to them. For this purpose a questionnaire was used in which the eight questions and alternate answers were listed. Those answers ranked first or second by the directors were assumed to be of highest importance and therefore should be evidenced in a detailed program description. The nature and extent of the discrepancy between what was ranked and what was written in descriptions would provide data for evaluation of the process of these programs. Since useable responses were received from 37 of the 44 institutions, only these 37 institutions were used in comparing the observed to the expected frequencies. Table I summarizes the comparison and indicates whether or not any differences are significant. A Chi Square test was applied to each set of frequencies to suggest which differences could have occurred by chance.

An inspection of Table I shows that for 28 of the 38 criteria of the components of the process, a significant difference exists between the perceptions of the readers of program descriptions and those of the program directors. All the differences are distributed across all eight questions somewhat equally with the exception of questions I and II. In the first question which asked for the bases of program experiences development, there was disagreement on the use of "total program evaluation" in the process. Directors indicated its use more frequently than did Readers.

The second question referred to conveying of expectations. There was disagreement on the use of "specific criteria for admission" and "requiring a specific level of achievement." In both cases, a higher frequency was indicated by Directors.

Table I

A Comparison of Program Elements as Perceived by Program Directors and Readers of Program Descriptions

Question	Observed by Director	Expected from Description	x^2	p
I What are the bases for the development of program experiences?				
A. Job Analysis	31‡	27	2.192	N.S.
B. Certification and accreditation requirements	6	6	0	N.S.
C. Evaluation of total program	31	19	15.578	.001
D. No clear indication	5	0	.675	N.S.
II How does the program convey its expectations to students over the entire time of the program?				
A. Specific criteria for admission	20*	8	23.143**	.001
B. Specific goals of program	24	25	.492	N.S.
C. Requires specific level of achievement	20	5	49.932	.001
D. Advisors assigned to students	13	17	1.781	N.S.
E. No clear indication	1	6	4.999	.03
III What kinds of information is obtained about student ability, attitudes, and values before and during their participation in the Program?				
A. Academic ability	28	37	21.892	.001
B. Use of standardized test scores	11	5	8.323	.01
C. Ratings by supervisors and cooperating teachers	28	27	.137	N.S.
D. No clear indication	4	10	4.934	.04

‡ = N=37

* = N=36, for Question II and VII only
** = d.f. = 1

	Question	Observed by Director	Expected from Description	x^2	p
IV	How is information about student ability, attitudes, and values utilized in program development?				
	A. Modifies content and/or sequence	28	11	37.293	.001
	B. Modifies entire program	29	1	786.177	.001
	C. No clear indication	5	29	91.872	.001
V	How is the performance of prospective teachers evaluated?				
	A. Grades in courses and field experiences	18	23	2.871	N.S.
	B. Self-evaluation by students	20	14	4.136	.05
	C. Descriptive observations	11	29	51.672	.001
	D. Pool of data	28	10	44.400	.001
	E. No clear indication	0	4	4.484	.03
VI	What are the criterion measures of program effectiveness?				
	A. Certification at completion of program	11	6	5.972	.02
	B. Students enter and remain in profession	10	6	3.181	N.S.
	C. Reports from school personnel (informal	34	19	13.092	.001
	D. Achievement of specific program goals	1	8	8.166	.01
	E. No clear indication	1	8	8.166	.01
VII	To what extent does the time spent in training and the experience provided reflect the changing role of prospective teachers over the time of the total program?				
	A. Courses and experiences specified	9	25	4.444	.05
	B. Courses and experiences flexible	24	12	17.760	.001
	C. Sequence specified	2	23	51.018	.001
	D. Sequence flexible	18	12	4.444	.05
	E. Time specified	3	30	128.442	.001
	F. Time flexible	14	4	28.333	.001
	G. Individualized program possible	10	4	10.090	.01
	H. No clear indication	0	2	2.114	N.S.

Question	Observed by Director	Expected from Description	x^2	p
VIII What relationship is there in the program between pre-service and in-service education?				
A. Some experiences are shared	8	9	.146	N.S.
B. Actively cooperate	25	5	92.500	.001
C. Provisions for contribution to program development	28	3	226.696	.001
D. No clear indication.	6	22	28.702	.001

These discrepancies and the many others reported can only be interpreted as suggesting the existence of a considerable lack of clarity between an external and internal view of the process of teacher preparation in these programs. One cannot help wondering if this ambiguity is shared by faculty members of these programs as well as by prospective teachers. Both have certain expectations and needs that are not made explicit and may therefore experience ambiguity, frustration through the apparent clarity of the process of teacher preparation.

In addition to process, the other aspect of teacher training programs consists of the content of the experiences. What do the programs require of their prospective teachers? Do these requirements represent important changes in program development? These questions will be considered next.

Program Content

Written program descriptions were used to identify the requirements for successful completion of each program. Some of the 44 programs had insufficient information about their requirements, necessitating a request to each for the necessary information.

As a basis for identifying changes in curricula, the required courses of areas in professional education identified by Conant some years ago were compared to the requirements of the current program sample.[4] The comparison is shown in Table 2.

It should be pointed out that 8 of the 44 programs did not specify separate courses or areas that could be identified as the same as those listed by Conant or by the other programs. They contained new and different kinds of experiences that included such titles as "Seminar Practicum"

TABLE 2

A Comparison Between Required Professional and Special Content Courses in 1963 and 1970

Name of Area or Course	1963 (N-35)		1970 (N-44)		
	No. of Institutions	Per Cent	No. of Institutions	Per Cent	Difference
1. Intro. to Education	24	68	15	34	-34
2. Psych. Dev. - Measurement	35	100	27	61	-39
3. Soc.-Hist-Phil.Foundations	24	68	24	54	-24
4. Curric. or Educ. Problems	8	22	5	11	-11
5. Practice Teaching	35	100	38	88	-12
6. General Methods	9	25	12	27	+ 2
7. Reading	19	53	24	54	+ 1
8. Language Arts	27	77	18	40	-37
9. Arithmetic	34	97	22	50	-47
10. Social Studies	32	91	18	40	-51
11. Science	34	97	16	36	-61
12. Health & Physical Education	33	93	10	22	-71
13. Child's Literature	23	65	11	25	-40
14. Music	32	91	15	34	-57
15. Arts and Crafts	30	85	12	27	-58
16. Speech for Teachers	6	17	4	9	- 2
17. Handwriting	3	8	2	4	- 4
18. Drama for Children	1	2	2	44	+ 2
19. Audio Visual Educ.	8	11	2	4	- 7
20. Food and Nutrition	2	5	0	0	- 5
21. Req/ Prof. Electives	4	11	2	4	- 7
22. Elementary Curriculum	3	8	3	6	- 2

TABLE 2

A Comparison Between Required Professional and Special Content Courses in 1963 and 1970

Name of Area or Course	1963 (N=35)		1970 (N=44)		
	No. of Institutions	Per Cent	No. of Institutions	Per Cent	Difference
23. Seminar Practicum			8	18	
24. Special Courses for Slow Learners			1	2	
25. Human Interaction			1	2	
26. Commun. Arts and Soc. Learning			1	2	
27. First Aid			1	2	
28. Youth in Urban Society			1	2	
29. Learning and Teaching			1	2	

"Human Interactions," "Communication Arts and Social Learning," "Youth in Urban Society," and "Learning and Teaching." The time devoted to these areas varied from one to eight semesters; some areas were variable according to the preferences of the students.

A comparison of the requirements of both samples in Table 2 allows the identification of some important differences. Of the basic professional courses (Nos. 1-5), there is a reduction in the number of institutions from 11 to 39 per cent. The greatest reduction is in the requirement of "Psychological Development; " the least changes concerned "Curricular Problems." Overall, there is a considerable reduction in these required professional courses.

The range of differences is far greater in the requirement of methods courses (Nos. 6-11). For these the range of differences is from +1 to -61 per cent. Most programs still require the "teaching of reading" while very few require the "teaching of science." With the exceptions of "general methods" and "reading," there is an important reduction in methods courses.

In the area of special content courses (Nos. 12-22), the range of differences is from +2 to -71 per cent. The most dramatic reduction is in "Health and Physical Education," the greatest increase is in "Drama for Children." However, in all of these areas the percentage figures do not convey the sense of the differences in terms of actual numbers of programs involved. For example, in the last instance cited (+2 to -71 per cent) the actual change was from 1 program out of 35 as compared to 2 programs out of 44. This is not an impressive change. The reduction in requiring "Health and P.E.," "Child's Literature," "Music," and "Arts and Crafts," is dramatic in both percentages and in actual number of programs.

The pattern of course requirements has changed in seven years from highly specific courses to a greater flexibility in selection and to some new courses that combine many elements of the "old" courses into a "new" experience. However, only eight programs contain new content areas. The others offer greater flexibility than before but within the same general content areas. The responsiveness of the majority of programs to the demands for greater relevance in content is called into question.

Process and Content

It was pointed out earlier that elements of the process of teacher preparation can be identified from public descriptions and those of directors. Although serious discrepancies exist between the two, nevertheless the process is clear. What is not clear is the extent to which the process as identified represents a greater responsiveness of programs to the needs and expectations of prospective teachers as well as to society.

Program content, unlike process, allows comparisons to be made over time so that changes may be identified in relation to a particular time or to specific social, educational, or individual condition. Eight of the programs were identified as representing an extreme change in professional course requirements and offerings when compared to the 1963 sample programs and to the others in the 1970 sample. An examination of their content in comparison to their process as described by their directors provides information about relationship of content to process in the programs that appear most different from others.

Of the eight programs categorized as innovative, two did not provide responses of process from their directors. The six programs providing complete information constitutes the sample for comparing content and process.

In each of the six programs, there is flexibility of professional educational requirements in content, sequence, and duration as well as flexibility in process. Students select experiences from among those available or they initiate new ones. The faculty is seen to be involved jointly with students in the planning and evaluation of the content of their program.

This joint involvement is reflected in the process through which the programs operate. Each program has a clear notion of its goals and the criteria for achievement within it. These criteria are conveyed to students through faculty. A variety of informal information about the students' performance is used to evaluate the on-going program, although ultimately it is the performance of students after they leave the program that is used to determine the program's effectiveness. Achievement of specified teacher performance as explicated in program goals is the main criterion used in program modification.

There appears to be little or no relationship between pre-service and in-service teachers to the extent that activities with in-service teachers is seen as an extension or a continuation of work performed earlier. In two programs, in-service teachers were deeply involved in their operation but not as graduates of those programs. Although all programs indicated in their descriptions that teacher training was an ongoing process, they had no provisions for doing anything about it.

It appears therefore, that flexibility in content is associated with flexibility in process. The programs are structured in ways which encourage the needs, and to a lesser extent the expectations of students to be identified and filled by the programs. Evaluation of students and program success is in terms of the competence of teachers reviewed by school

personnel and by the beginning teacher.

How does program content and process compare for those institutions in which the professional education course requirements are specified? An item by item comparison was undertaken of responses to each of the eight questions by directors of the six "innovative" and the 37 other programs. With only one exception, there appeared to be no pattern of differences between the programs. The difference noted was in response to question VI, which asked how the time and sequence in the program reflected the changing role of the prospective teacher. Five of the six "innovative" programs listed "courses and experiences flexible," as their first choice; the sixth program identified "individualized program available" as its first choice. This compares to 20 of the 37 programs selecting "flexibility" first and another seven choosing "individualized program" first.

It is clear that the "innovative" programs are indeed flexible in their content and in their process. The same cannot be said for the 27 other programs that indicate flexibility on the questionnaire but show no real flexibility in their content, sequence, or duration of the experiences available to their prospective teachers. Perhaps "flexibility" to them means that alternative courses and/or sets of sequences are available. No matter what their interpretation, their "flexibility" is considerably different from that of the other six programs.

What directors say about their program's process of teacher preparation may differ considerably from what in fact may occur. Professional course requirements are the heart of any program. The procedure through which these are changed, how students select experiences, and how the realities of the teaching task is made the basis of program goals, is what teacher

education is all about. It doesn't appear that the great majority of the sample programs are doing much about it.

Conclusions

Flexibility in process appears to be developing in a number of institutions while modification of content is yet to come. The problems are numerous for an institution that desires to provide a flexible and relevant program for their prospective teachers while, at the same time dealing with faculty attitudes, certification requirements, budget, student demands, and social needs. The fact that several programs are already changing the process and content of their programs should provide encouragement to others. However, encouragement isn't enough. Procedures should be developed which may provide guidelines of change for those programs that want it.

The thesis of this paper is that the needs of the prospective teacher, as well as those of the common school, should be a critical consideration in any teacher preparation program. For if teachers continue to teach as they have been taught, it suggests that programs of preparation now only meet the needs of teachers to survive in a classroom. For teachers to be innovative in their classroom and meet the needs of their students, they must participate in programs that are innovative and that meet their needs.

1. Brottman, Marvin A. "A Psycho-Social Model of Teacher Education." Paper presented at the meeting of American Educational Research Association, 1970. Also found in ERIC, Clearinghouse for Teacher Education, November, 1969.

2. Brottman, Marvin A. "Relevance in Teacher Education," The Journal of Educational Thought. Vol. 4, No. 3, December 1970, 143-151.

3. American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education. The Distinguished Achievement Award for Excellence in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C., 1969.

4. Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963. P. 257.